DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 414 613 CS 509 650

AUTHOR Wong, Jean
TITLE Delayed Next Turn Repair Initiation.
PUB DATE 1994-00-00
NOTE 41p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; *Discussion; *Interpersonal Communication; Language Research; Language Usage; Mandarin Chinese; *Native Speakers; *Oral Language
IDENTIFIERS Conversation Theory; Conversational Analysis; *Nonnative Speakers; *Repairs (Language); Turn Taking

ABSTRACT

A study examined a form of other-initiated repair which occurs later than next turn, a form which is produced by nonnative speakers of English whose native language is Mandarin. Data consists of transcriptions of naturally occurring conversations from 12 native speaker-nonnative speaker (NS-NNS) dyads, friends who ordinarily chat. Conversational analysis showed that in NS-NNS conversation other-initiated repair is not always done immediately, that is, in next-turn position (Schegloff et al., 1977). On some occasions other-initiated repair is delayed. For the nonnative speakers in the data the process involved in other-initiated repair may involve a two-step procedure: other speaker (NNS) initially receipts "troublesome talk" and subsequent to that, initiates repair. Conversation analysis research has established that participants engaged in everyday conversation orient to sequential order--the turn-taking system through which talk must pass is not a "structureless medium" but forms a basis for how speakers come to understand one another (Schegloff, 1989). Empirical evidence displayed in this study supports the suggestion that small bits of behavior such as "un huh" and the like, do not display or evidence understanding but, at best, "claim" it (Schegloff, 1982). Findings suggest that the notion of sequential relevancies as a resource by which participants themselves come to produce talk which is mutually intelligible may, on occasion, be somewhat different when the context is NS-NNS interaction; apparently NNSs do not necessarily use all the resources available to them for repairing talk. (Contains 10 references and 11 notes.) (NKA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 414 613

Delayed Next Turn Repair Initiation

Jean Wong, Assistant Professor

The College of New Jersey

Department of Language and Communication Sciences

P.O. Box 7718

Ewing, NJ 08628-0718

Tel: 609 771-2440 (o); 609 683-7580 (h)

jwong@tcnj.edu

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Wong

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 536 650

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Delayed Next Turn Repair Initiation[1]

Introduction

This paper examines a form of other-initiated repair which occurs later than next turn, a form which is produced by nonnative speakers of English whose native language is Mandarin. Using the framework of conversation analysis, I show that in NS-NNS conversation other-initiated repair is not always done immediately, that is, in next turn position (Schegloff et al., 1977). On some occasions other-initiated repair is delayed. For the nonnative speakers in my data, the process involved in other-initiated repair may involve a two-step procedure:other speaker (NNS) initially receipts 'troublesome talk'and subsequent to that, initiates repair. I begin the discussion by providing some background on the import of sequential order in everyday social interaction, and in particular, the practice which participants engaged in conversation display of hearing current and next turns as tied to one another.

The Achievement of Mutual Understanding

Studies in conversation analysis have established that participants engaged in everyday conversation orient to sequential order. The turn-taking system through which all talk must pass is not a 'structureless medium' but forms a basis for how speakers come to understand one another (Schegloff, 1989). As Heritage puts it:

> ...conversational interaction is structured by an organization of action which is implemented on a turn-

by-turn basis. By means of this organization, a **context of publicly displayed and continuously up-dated intersubjective understanding is systematically sustained** (emphasis is his). It is through this 'turn-by-turn' character of talk that the participants display their understandings of the 'state of the talk' for one another...(Heritage 1984:259)

Two turns are central in the achievement of mutual understanding:current and next turns. Participants rely on the adjacent positioning of these turns as a resource for understanding the state of the talk:

> Utterances are what Sacks calls sequence relevant and their sequence relevance is part of what provides for understanding...Conversation seems to be designed in such a way that any next thing one says can only be understood in the context of what went before. (Rawls 1989:160)

Thus in the context of current and next turns we have an interactionally-generated cohesion; we have the sort of socially shared knowledge that comes from hearing next turn as an analysis, appreciation, understanding, and the like, of the just prior turn at talk.

Participants show awareness of this sequential linkage between current and next turns in various ways. For instance, if a next utterance is not what should have followed 'next,' the utterance to be delivered is often marked as disjunctive,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

prefaced by a 'misplacement marker' (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973):

(1)

Tang: Yeah for the temple you know when the children grow up you know

(0.4)

--> Tang: Ohd- by the way did you get the tapess?

(0.4)

Jim: Oh yeah I did

[TJ, 4:4]

In turn-initial position, Tang utters "Ohd-" which was probably the beginning of 'Oh did.' She cuts off the "Ohd-" and does a self-repair, inserting the phrase "by the way." After the insertion Tang recycles the "d" when she asks, "did you get the tapess?" The phrase "by the way" signals that the utterance to be produced: "has a proper place in conversation, but is about to be done outside its proper place." (Schegloff 1987:72)

Furthermore, there is the sort of 'achieved relatedness' (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973) between current and next turns manifest in adjacency pair structures. The doing of a first pair part e.g., greeting, invitation, question, and the like, makes conditionally relevant in the next turn a particular sort of second pair part i.e., return greeting, acceptance, answer, and the like. One consequence of the adjacency pair format is that if a second pair part is not delivered its absence may be a noticeable, talked-about matter.[2]

On yet another front, the one most relevant here, the

interactional practice of hearing current and next turns as tied to one another is manifest in the system of repairing talk.

Next Turn Repair Initiation

Prior research on repair in ordinary conversation has shown that efforts directed at problems in understanding by other than the speaker of the trouble-source utterance are initiated in one main sequential environment:next turn, that is, the turn coming immediately after the trouble-source turn (Schegloff et al., 1977). The recipient of the trouble-source utterance signals that ongoing talk is momentarily stopped and that repair is the order of business 'now' when s/he produces a 'next turn repair initiator' (henceforth 'NTRI'), forms of which I will provide momentarily.

When an NTRI is produced, a sequence of three turns is oriented to by participants:

Other-Initiated Repair Sequence

Turn 2: Talk

Turn 1: NTRI (targets turn 2)

Turn 3: Response to the NTRI

We have talk which becomes troublesome or problematic, a repair-initiator directed to that talk and a response to the repair initiated. The NTRI is labeled turn 1 because this is the turn which begins the repair sequence. At turn 1, some element of the just prior turn, or all of the just prior turn, is targeted as problematic or troublesome; this talk constitutes turn 2 of the repair sequence. And in turn 3, whatever was problematic or

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

troublesome gets addressed or resolved. These three turns form a base repair sequence.[3]

In turn 1, recipient of the trouble-source talk may use a variety of techniques for initiating repair. Among the techniques Schegloff et al. (1977) have observed are those shown below: (Note: Wherever possible, I use examples from the data collected and in particular instances produced by nonnative speakers of English. 'TST' indicates the trouble-source turn and the arrow indicates the NTRI.)

(a) 'Huh?", "what?", "pardon?", and the like;

(2)

TST Vera: Does he have hair?

(0.6)

--> **Huang: Pardon me?**

Vera: Does he have haiR?

Huang: Yes.

Vera: Ohh huh-huh-huh-huh

[HV, 3:20]

(3)

TST Mary: hih-hih Don't you think he fits into it now?

(0.4)

--> **Chu: What?**

Mary: Do you think it- it's(.) the right size?

Chu: Uh::

Mary: =Or(.) maybe a little big

[CM, 4:14]

(b) Categorical question words such as: "who", "when", "where", and the like;

(4)

TST Jane: So(.) the night that Sun called he was calling to tell us you had your baby?

(0.2)

--> **Huang: Who?**

Jane: Sun:: called

(0.2)

Huang: Mm hmm

[HJ, 15:9]

(c) A partial repetition of the trouble-source turn;

(5)

Huang: Well maybe you are busy=h-how's your school?

TST Vera: Well (0.2) tch it's kinduv hard but it's going oka::y *h I haveto *h um:(.) I need to type two papers

--> **Huang: Two (papers?) (paper(h)?)**

Vera: Yeah:: they're due next week.

Huang: Mm [hmm.

Vera: [an' then I have tests(.) next Wednesday Thursday an' Friday

Huang: Waw::!

Vera: Yeah::! It'sa lo::t.

[HV, 4]

(6)

Ruan: Okay uh:: do you know(.) anyone else whaat:: what

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

they're gonna bring?

TST Liz: *h Yeah I do *h

--> **Ruan: You do?**

Liz: Um:: let's see (d-) hot [dogs

Ruan: [gi- so give me some idears uh yeah

Liz: Oh(.) um:: hot dogs *h

Ruan: Mm hmm.

[RL, 4]

(7)

Liu: *h Yeah uhd- did you go to somewhere(h)? (0.2) this year?

(0.2)

Ann: No not yet [I'm thinking I might go some plac(h):e uh in the fall

Liu: [(h)i(h)-hih

(0.2)

--> **Liu: Oh in the fall(h)?**

Ann: Yeah

[AL, 4]

(d) A partial repetition of the trouble-source turn plus a question word;

(8)

Sue: Yeah we used to live, on the highway, too. And when we first moved up there, it was terrible sleeping because all these semis were going by at night.

((short silence))

--> **Bob: All the what?**

Sue: Semis.

Bob: Oh

[Schegloff et al. 1977, BH:1A:14]

(9)

B: Was last night the first time you met Missiz Kelly?

(1.0)

--> **A: Met whom?**

B: Missiz Kelly,

A: Yes.

[Schegloff et al. 1977, SBL:2:1:8:5]

and (e) a possible understanding of the just prior turn.

(10)

Beth: *h you sortof want- this is thee um

(0.6)

Lin: final week?

TST Beth: Well not <u>quite</u>=we had finals hh um (0.4) about thee sixteenth I guess it is (let's see) (0.2) seventeenth and nineteenth an' then (0.2) I haveto:: ge- gr- get grades in by the twenty-third hh

(0.4)

--> **Lin: You mean n- June?**

Beth: =Yes.

Lin: Oh:::

[BL, 2]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(11)

TST Helen: Do you have any finals(h)(h?

(0.4)

--> **Mei: You mea- you mean(.) this year?**

Helen: Mm hmm

Mei: *h uh(h)(h) (0.2) yeah <u>his</u>tor(h)y

[HM, 1]

(12)

Li: How how- 'bout you-you(.) still uh teach writing?

(0.2)

Sara: Tch not <u>this</u> quarter.

(0.2)

Li: Oh, not this quar[(ter)

TST Sara: [Yeah, (0.2) yeah thi- this quarter I hafto workgon my:: thesis so uh:: [so I decid-

--> **Li: [Oh:: you quit your <u>job</u>.**

Sara: *h *h yeah (0.2) [yeah.

Li: [Oh:: I see.

[SL, 5]

Cutting across the range of NTRI techniques exemplified above, what remains consistent is the placement of the repair-initiator: <u>next turn</u> relative to the trouble-source turn. According to Schegloff et al. (1977), this observation is virtually across-the-board (i.e., the acronym 'NTRI' which stands for 'next turn repair initiator'):

...out of the multiplicity of later turns by others

> that follow a potential repairable, very nearly all other-initiations come in just one of them, namely next turn, AND NOT IN LATER TURNS BY OTHER(S)...(emphasis is theirs, 1977:373)

The next turn represents the first sequential position from which other speaker <u>can</u> initiate repair on the immediately prior turn. In the structuring of the 'repair initiation oppportunity space' recipient of the trouble-source utterance gets the first opportunity to display a problem with the just prior turn in next turn position (Schegloff et al., 1977).

Further, that other-initiated repairs <u>do</u> occur in next turn and 'NOT IN LATER TURNS BY OTHER(S'is compatible with the claim that in ordinary conversation repairs are ordinarily 'caught' as early as possible (Schegloff et al. 1977). Earliest possible sequential location from which other speaker can initiate repair on the immediately prior turn is the place from which other speaker <u>does</u> initiate repair i.e., next turn.[4]

Given the foregoing discussion, it is striking to find that in the data examined NNSs do not always position a 'next turn' repair initiator in the next turn relative to the troublesource turn.

<u>Database</u>

The data collected and transcribed for this study, which is composed of roughly 120 pages of transcript, consist of naturally-occurring conversations from twelve NS-NNS dyads (All NNSs speak Mandarin as their native language). The speakers are

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

friends who ordinarily have occasion to chat with one another. They did not speak with one another solely for the purposes of making a recording. Topics were neither suggested nor assigned. The recorded conversations were transcribed using a transcription system originally developed by Gail Jefferson (cf. Atkinson and Heritage, 1984).

Delayed Next Turn Repair Initiation [produced by NNSs]

In examining instances of other-initiated repair produced by NNSs the case below was initially set aside because the 'NTRI' is not in the next turn relative to the trouble-source turn: (Note: The triple X's ('XXX') indicate an initial response produced by the speaker who initiates repair and the triple Y's ('YYY') indicate a turn which comes just before the repair-initiator.)

(13)

Beth: Last week(.) um:: (0.2) I was- (.) doing some papers(.) of mine

Lin: Uh huh

Beth: It was about six forty five sevenish

(0.2)

Lin: Oh:::[(ng)

Beth: [I thought oh::: I'm just so tired: I think I'll close my eyes just- I'll just take a short nap

(0.4)

Lin: Mm hmm

TST Beth: I woke up at eleven o'clock

XXX Lin: tchwow!

YYY (0.4)

--> **Lin: *h You works the whole night?**

Beth: No no no no I- I- no no no no I mean- six- six thirty or seven at night

Lin: Oh:::

Beth: I mean I was already tired cause I'd been teaching all day:: [ehih (-hih)

[BL, 5:6]

Lin's repair initiator, "*h You works the whole night?", is placed not in the turn directly following the problematic talk but after his own "tchwow!" (I will discuss the place indicated by the 'YYY' later.) Thus the repair initiator and the trouble-source turn are not immediately adjacent to one another as was the case in all of the exemplars of NTRI presented in the immediately preceding section.

This reason for setting the instance aside was in essence an observation about it and formed the basis for discovering more examples of a similar sort:

(14)

Sara: *h *h but I'm still takin' two courses too this quarter(.) (two) (too) so uh::

Li: Oh:::

Li: [What courses?

Sara:[That's quite a bit.

Sara: *h *h um:: cur- curriculum development?

(0.2)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Li: Uh [huh

Sara: [285K *h *h

Li: Uh huh

TST Sara: An' then:: a seminar in:: economics

(0.4)

XXX Li: Oh::

YYY Sara: tch so-

Sara: [*h

--> **Li: [Oh:: seminar in economics?**

Sara: Yeah:: *h *h

Li: Good.

[SL, 5:4]

Once again, it is observed that the repair-initiator, "[Oh:: seminar in economics?", is placed not in the turn which immediately follows the troublesome utterance but in a later turn.

Other talk comes between the 'trouble-source turn' and the turn in which repair is initiated. Li utters "Oh::" in the first position in the repair-opportunity space allotted to her after the 'trouble-source turn.' A response such as "Oh::" treats the just prior turn as adequate or nonproblematic.[5] Subsequent to that, Sara utters "tch so-."

The utterance "Oh" is also observed as a preliminary response in these sequences:

(15)

Beth: I would <u>sure</u> be tempted I must say I think I'd go

tuh my pediatrician an' ask for a tranquilizer

Lin: huh-huh-huh-huh

Beth: =for either the baby or me one or the other or both huh-huh-huh-huh-[huh-huh-huh-huh

Lin: [huck-(h) *h Wel-l you can't because wel-l she can't because *h they are driving long distance and then at leastte they- the- the adults have to *h have to be awake otherwi(h)se

Beth: (yeah::)

Lin: who is going to drive *h an' when- wh-when one(.) gets tired thee other one has to take it over(h)uh take over the (veel) (wheel) (view) *h

TST Beth: so they were gonna go all the way to Montreal in nine days

XXX Lin: Oh::

YYY (0.2)

--> **Lin: Nine days?**

Beth: Yeah

Lin: Jeesus

(0.3)

Beth: =That's not(.) that's not impossible but it=it's going to be hard::

Lin:=yeah it is because last- uh no (0.2) uh:: two years ago?

Beth: Uh huh

Lin: I went to:: uh::: Virginia?

Beth: Uh huh

Lin: An' then we drove all the way up(.) there it-

oh::: (0.2) I didn't drive [butt

Beth: [mm hmm ((very softly))

Lin: the two ladies who drove (0.2) it's REALly tiring

(0.2)

Beth: Oh:: yeah

[BL, 20:23]

(16)

Joan: So where you living now?

(0.2)

Chen: Well:: pritty good::

(0.3)

Joan: [Yea-

Chen: [My roommate is uh:: photography by profession

(h)hih (*h)

Joan: Uh huh

Chen: Yeah

(0.3)

Joan: Yeah

(0.3)

TST Joan: I- j- I jus' talk tuh Li Li Hwa?

XXX Chen: Oh::

(0.2)

TST Joan: An:: that's how I gut your number.

(0.2)

XXX Chen: Oh.

YYY Joan: An:: she

Joan: [wa-

--> **Chen: [Oh:: you- you got my numbuh:: from Li Li Hwa.**

Joan: Yeah

Chen: But jus' uh:: two hours (0.2) two hours ago I wen' to thuh office

Chen: o[f Harry

Joan: [Yeah

Joan: (h)yeah (h)yeah (h)hih-(h)hih

(0.3)

Chen: An I left uh:: my address an:: uh phone numbuh (0.5) uh:: to him.

Joan: Yeah

(0.2)

Joan: Yeah

Chen: But I didn't uh:: sssee him.

(0.2)

Joan: Oh::

(0.2)

Chen: He wuz: uh not uh at his office uh I jus uh ask uh his secretary to:: give uh my numb- um uh:: phone number to him.

[CJ, 3-4]

When Lin (15) and Chen in (16) respond respectively to the immediately prior turn with the bit of talk, "Oh," they do not

display at that moment in the emergent talk that they have a problem understanding the immediately prior turn. The utterance "Oh" is hearable to its recipient as 'unremarkable' i.e., the talk to which "Oh" responds is not worthy of further development, topical expansion, and the like.

Nonetheless, a repair sequence develops over the course of the talk, turn-by-turn in this manner: (Note: I use the letters 'A', 'B', and 'C' to indicate the turns which <u>precede</u> the initiation of repair and the numbers '1', '2', and '3' to indicate the turns implicated in the repair sequence.)

<u>Delayed Other-Initiated Repair Sequence</u> [NNSs]

Turn A ('turn 2' of repair sequence): Talk [NS]

Turn B: "Oh" [NNS]

Turn C: gap/silence/talk

Turn 1: Repair-initiator (targets turn A) [NNS]

Turn 3: Response to the repair-initiator [NS]

Observe that for the data fragments under consideration a base repair sequence implicates <u>six</u> turns at talk (unlike the canonical structure for NTRI discussed earlier which implicates three turns at talk). As the talk unfolds, when turn A is initially produced it is not heard as troublesome or problematic. In turn B, a response such as "Oh" treats the talk of turn A as adequate. Yet at turn 1, the talk orients back to turn A which is 'now' treated as problematic or troublesome. And in turn 3, a response to the repair initiator is delivered by the speaker of what has now become the trouble-source turn.

About the "Oh", one might reason that this sort of response lies at the opposite end of the spectrum from repair. As a 'next' turn item delivered in response to a just prior turn, the "Oh" would appear to signal 'No trouble here.'[6] It is striking that when a just prior turn has just been responded to as 'unremarkable,' as signaled by the use of "Oh," that initiation of repair constitutes a next sequential activity.

In support, I cite Heritage's (1984) work on "Oh" in other-initiated repair sequences. He finds that "Oh" occurs at the closure of a repair sequence as in these instances:

[Note:Examples are numbered as they appear in Heritage (1984).]

(32) [C & D:9]

A: Well who'r you workin' for.

B: *hhh Well I'm working through the Amfat Corporation.

--> A: The who?

B: Amfah Corpora[tion. T's a holding company.

--> A: [Oh.

B: Yeah

[Schegloff et al. 1977]

. (structural display of 32)

1. A: Repairable

2. B: Repair initiation

3. A: Repair

4. B: "Oh" receipt

(39) [SF:2:5:simplified]

B: So::: we thought thet yihknow= if you wanna come on over early. C'mon over.

--> M: *hhh- *hhhh::::::Ah::: hhh fer dinner yih mean? hh

--> B: No not fer dinner. h=

--> M: =Oh

[Heritage 1984:319]

(structural display of 39)

1. A: Repairable
2. B: Understanding check ((repair initiation))
3. A: Confirmation/disconfirmation ((repair))
4. B: "Oh" receipt

In Heritage's examples, the "Oh" receipts the repair. Coming at a moment in the repair sequence after trouble-resolution, the "Oh" serves as a 'sequence exiting device' (Heritage 1984) which, in effect, signals that whatever was problematic or troublesome before has been resolved 'now.' The ordering of activities with respect to the trouble or problem is: repair-resolution and then "Oh" receipt.

On the other hand, for the earlier instances (14), (15), and (16) just the opposite seems to occur. The "Oh" here does not come after trouble-resolution but before repair-initiation, before the repair sequence begins. The ordering of activities is: "Oh"-receipt and then repair-initiation. What was understood before at turn B becomes problematic 'now' at turn 1.

A similar phenomenon is observed in these sequences:

(17)[7]

('Ns' is the native speaker and ''Ju' the nonnative speaker of English.)

Ns: =Well she had- a lot of her family were here. Her daughter [(0.3) who lives in Washington (.) [I dunno=

Ju: [Mm hmm [Oh: I see.

NS: =if you remember seeing her.very pretty young woman.=

Ju: =Uh h[uh.

Ns: [She flew in specially.

Ju: Oh I s[ee.

Ns. [From Washington D.C.(.) to be with her mother on that special day.

Ju: Oh I see.=

TST Ns: =And her grandson was here.

XXX Ju: Uh huh.

YYY (1.0)

--> **Ju: Oh, grandson?**

Ns: Right.

--> **Ju: Yesterday?**

Ns: Yeah.

Ju: Did I meet?

(0.5)

Ns: Uh:m(.) he was a young man. You probably met him.

(0.8)

Ju: Mm [hm.

Ns: [Maybe you don't remember.

(0.8)

Ju: Yeah. 'T's very nice.

Ns: Yeah. And Ruthy has such a pretty backyard.

[Riggenbach 1989]

(18)

Han: So when are you going to(.) Boston

TST Irene: tch *h I'm going to go:: the last uh:: t(h)wo weeks (0.2) of Jewly

XXX Han: Uh huh

YYY Irene: tch *h so::

--> **Han: Oh: so you mean jus stay there for two weeks?**

Irene: *h (0.2) Y-eah so that I c'n uh: get a job

[first

Han: [uh huh

Irene: [before I move back there

Han: [uh huh

(0.2)

Han: Oh I:: see so you- [g-o

Irene: [well-

Han: there first to to interview uh something then *h when the uh::

Irene:=then come back here:

Han: =Uh huh

Irene: An' then:: maybe move back: in: September

[IH, 6:6]

In these examples, the utterance "uh huh" occupies turn B. This utterance also performs the task of receipting talk which later becomes troublesome talk.

Accordingly, all of the instances under examination are represented schematically in this manner, with the activity of receipt occurring at turn B:

Delayed Other-Initiated Repair Sequence [NNSs]

Turn A ('turn 2' of repair sequence): Talk [NS]

Turn B: Receipt [NNS]

Turn C: Gap/Talk

Turn 1: Repair-initiator (targets turn A) [NNS]

Turn 3: Response to the repair-initiator [NS]

When NNS responds to the talk of turn A with utterances such as "uh huh", "oh", "tchwow", and the like, s/he claims understanding of the talk of the just prior turn and in doing so, s/he passes up the first opportunity space afforded him/her for initiating repair on the talk of turn A.[8] But at the moment of the repair-initiator, the NNS seems to do a doubletake; s/he now finds the talk of turn A to be problematic, surprising, contrary to expectation, and the like.

Retrospectively, the talk displays that NNS analyzes turn A twice, once immediately in next turn position i.e., at turn B and once immediately after turn C i.e., at turn 1. The repair-initiator constitutes a reanalysis of the talk of turn A. At the moment of repair initiation, recipient (NNS) now displays that s/he orients to the talk of turn A differently from the way she

had oriented to it before. Where NNS had claimed understanding of turn A before as signaled by a receipt token ("Oh," "uh huh," "mm hmm," and the like), s/he now orients to the matter that the claim was possibly incorrect or was in some way inadequate. Thus, at turn 1 the status of the talk at turn A has changed, from being 'nonproblematic talk' to being now problematic talk.

In this regard, it is important to describe what goes on at turn C ('YYY') because this is the turn which immediately precedes the repair initiator. How might turn C possibly influence or affect NNS's later detection of trouble at turn 1?

The observation is noted that since NNS has just taken turn B, the next turn i.e., turn C, could in principle revert to NS, the speaker of the 'trouble-source turn.' Indeed, in examples (16), (14) and (18), NS <u>does</u> talk again. In (16), Joan utters, "an:: she", and in (14) and (18), Irene and Sara produce "tch so-" and "tch *h so::" respectively.

Yet these utterances are of a minimal nature. They may be the sort of utterances which orient the participants to the matter that the turn just under way may not develop into a full turn at talk. Indeed, in these exemplars, the speaker of turn C (NS) does exit the turn, and in (14) and (16) s/he yields to interruption by the NNS. Therefore, even when the rights to the floor <u>do</u> revert to NS at turn C, the talk displays that the NS produces the sort of talk which does not fully embrace the turn.

Futhermore, notice that there is <u>no</u> talk at turn C in examples (13), (15) and (17). In (15), there is a gap of two

tenths of a second and in (13) and (17), there are gaps of four tenths of a second and one full second respectively. One might view these gaps of silence as places in the talk where speaker of the 'trouble-source turn'--NS--might appropriately have talked given the suggestion above that turn C could in principle revert to NS.

What are we to make, then, of the observation that the NS, the speaker of the 'trouble-source turn' (turn A), produces minimal talk or no talk at turn C? One possibility is that the NS does a slight withholding of talk at turn C, which in effect provides recipient of turn A (NNS) with another opportunity to talk again. Why might speaker of the 'trouble-source turn' (NS) provide recipient (NNS) with another opportunity to talk again? One explanation might be that the NS, the speaker of turn A, may have oriented to a different sort of 'next turn' utterance than the one that was produced at turn B or, at least, an utterance which 'does more' than a receipting of the talk at turn B. By not fully embracing the next turn at turn C, the NS may be providing recipient of turn A (NNS) with another opportunity to respond to the talk of turn A.

Indeed, the talk displays that the recipient of turn A (NNS) does reanalyze the talk of turn A. The NNS now produces an entirely different sort of 'next turn' utterance, one at the opposite end of the spectrum from a receipt token which displays nothing 'remark-able' here. Moreover, the initiation of repair at turn 1 will have consequences on the shape and direction of the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

talk. Matters which were not brought up before, that is, not brought up at turn B, are brought up now after repair has been initiated. These matters will affect, to varying degrees, the trajectory of the talk in the course of resolving the troublesome talk. For instance, in (14) and (15) assessments are now in order after the speaker of the trouble-source turn confirms the repair-initiator. In (14), Li's assessment, "Good", closes down the repair sequence while in (15), Lin's assessment, "Jeesus", leads to clarification from Beth that the nine day car ride will not be "impossible" but will be "hard::." And in Lin's subsequent turn, he works into the talk a telling about an arduous car ride which he once took to Seattle ("=yeah it is because last- uh no (0.2) uh:: two years ago...").

In (17), and (18), the talk coming after the repair is initiated readdresses earlier talk. In (17), after repair has been initiated at turn 1, Ju asks "Yesterday?", which may be interpreted as 'now' questioning whether he and the NS have been talking about the same social occasion. Subsequent to that, there is a question about whether Ju had met the grandson at the party;he does not recall meeting the grandson at the party.

In (18), Han now seeks clarification of what Irene meant when she said earlier at turn A that she will be going to Boston the last two weeks of July. This request for clarification is to be understood against an earlier sequence of talk, which is labeled below as (18A):

(18A)

1 Han: So(h)o:(h) how are you

2 Irene: *h *h (0.2) I'm good::

3 Irene: [(h) I'm good::

4 Han: [Uh huh uh

5 Han: [huh

6 Irene: [I'm mum tch *h thinkeen(.) aboutt(.)

7 moving(.) t(h)o Providence

8 Han: Providence? Uh

9 Han: [huh

10 Irene: e(h) (h)u(h) *h *h Yeah::: I'm at- I'm

11 thinkin about that

[IH, 2:11-12]

Notice that in prior talk, Irene had informed Han that she was moving to Providence, and thus what Han's talk of example (18) appears to be doing is rechecking this information. He now hears Irene to be saying that she is going to Providence for two weeks, and he doublechecks to find out whether Irene's move is intended as a temporary one.

Also, in (16), the talk coming after repair is initiated now clarifies earlier talk, labeled here as (16A):

(16A)

1 Joan: *h Hi how are you?

2 (0.2)

3 Chen: Oh:: (0.2) henhao ((Mandarin for 'very good'))

4 Joan: *h *h I:: tried tuh leave you two:: notes tuhday

jus tuh try(h) duh(h) git your phone number (h)
Joan: [hih-hih
Chen: [Yeah
Joan: *h I left you one (an') (in) uh
Joan: [*h biology
Chen: [Yeah
Joan: department an' one-
Chen:=Well jus uh two hours ago I went to::
Joan: (h)hih-huh-[huh-huh
Chen: [uh:: Harry's office.
Joan: Oh really!
(0.2)
Chen: Yeah.
(0.3)
Joan: Oh::
(0.5)
Joan: [Did he tell you I wuz I tried tuh call you las'
night?
Chen: [I-
(0.2)
Chen: Uh:: yeah.
(0.2)
Joan: Yeah.
(0.7)
Joan: An: so you've movett.
Chen: Yeah(.) I move uh:: to uh: new apartmint jus uh::

31 two weeks ago.

[CJ, 1-2]

Chen had moved and neither informed Joan of the move nor of his new phone number. At lines 4-5 above, Joan may be doing a mild complaint, saying how difficult it has been trying to get in touch with Chen e.g., she "tried" to leave Chen "two notes" "jus tuh try(h) duh(h) git your phone number(h)."

At Chen's utterance of line 12 ("Well jus uh two hours ago I went to::...[uh:: Harry's office."), he may be rebutting the complaint. He may be trying to explain that he is not at fault for being out of touch because "two hours ago" he went to "Harry's office" (Harry is Joan's spouse).

Example (16), repeated below for ease of reference, is now relevant to the discussion:

(16)

1 Joan: So where you living now?
2 (0.2)
3 Chen: Well:: pritty good::
4 (0.3)
5 Joan: [Yea-
6 Chen: [My roommate is uh:: calligraphy by profession
7 (h)ih (*h)
8 Joan: Uh huh
9 Chen: Yeah
10 (0.3)
11 Joan: Yeah

12 (0.3)

13 Joan: I- j- I jus' talk tuh Li Li Hwa?

14 Chen: Oh::

15 (0.2)

16 Joan: An:: that's how I gut your number.

17 (0.2)

18 Chen: Oh.

19 Joan: An:: she

20 Joan: [wa-

--> 21 Chen: [Oh:: you- you got my numbuh:: from Li Li Hwa.

22 Joan: Yeah

23 Chen: But jus' uh:: two hours (0.2) two hours ago I

24 wen' to thuh office

25 Chen: o[f Harry

26 Joan: [Yeah

27 Joan: (h) yeah (h)yeah (h)hih-(h)hih

28 (0.3)

29 Chen: An I left uh:: my address an:: uh phone numbuh

30 (0.5) uh:: to him.

31 Joan: Yeah

32 (0.2)

33 Joan: Yeah

34 Chen: But I didn't uh:: sssee him.

35 (0.2)

36 Joan: Oh::

37 (0.2)

38 Chen: He was: uh <u>not</u> uh at his office uh I jus uh ask
39 his secretary to:: give uh my numb- um uh:: phone
40 number to him.
[CJ, 3-4]

At lines 13 and 16, Joan informs Chen that she had obtained his phone number from "Li Li Hwa." Chen 'now' realizes, as signaled by the repair initiator of lines 21-22, that Joan did not get his telephone number from "Harry's office." Now, in an echoing of lines from earlier sequences of talk (example 16A), Chen reaffirms in lines 23-25 that two hours ago he had gone to Harry's office.

What is crucial about this subsequent repetition of the fact that Chen had gone to Harry's office is that this time, at lines 29-30 above, Chen states that he left his phone number and address at Harry's office. These words were missing from Chen's earlier explanation/complaint rebuttal (cf. lines 12-14 of example 16A), but apparently Chen had proceeded in the talk with the 'shared knowledge' that Joan had obtained his telephone number from "Harry" (or "Harry's office").

At the repair initiator, a misunderstanding 'now' comes to light and is clarified. It is only after Joan informs Chen that she had obtained his phone number from "Li Li Hwa" does he realize that Joan did not get his phone number from "Harry." With that newly displayed knowledge of what is and is not 'shared information' between them, Chen now goes back and does clarification on his own prior talk (16A). He now states overtly

that he had left his phone number and address at Harry's office.

On this particular occasion, there is much that needs to be set right. The NNS not only reanalyzes the talk of turn A, producing a response which 'does more than' a mere receipting of the talk of turn A, but in so doing, he gets an opportunity to clarify a misunderstanding which had almost passed by undetected.

Also, in (13), repeated below, what is relevant in the talk after NNS produces a delayed next turn repair initiator is talk which aims at clarifying a misunderstanding:

(13)

	1	Beth: Last week(.) um:: (0.2) I was- (.) doing some
	2	papers(.) of mine
	3	Lin: Uh huh
	4	Beth: It was about six forty five sevenish
	5	(0.2)
	6	Lin: Oh::: [(ng)
	7	Beth: [I thought oh::: I'm just so tired: I think I'll
	8	close my eyes just- I'll just take a short nap
	9	(0.4)
	10	Lin: Mm hmm
TST	11	Beth: I woke up at eleven o'clock
XXX	12	Lin: tchwow!
YYY	13	(0.4)
-->	**14**	**Lin: *h You works the <u>whole</u> <u>night</u>?**
	15	Beth: No no no no I- I- no no no no I mean- six- six

16 thirty or seven at night
17 Lin: Oh:::
18 Beth: I mean I was already tired cause I'd been
19 teaching all day:::
20 Beth: [ehih
21 Lin: [Uh huh uh huh
22 (0.2)
23 Beth: So I just thought ((next segment slightly softer
24 voice)) well I ('ll just) take a little nap
25 Lin: Uh::
26 Beth: fou- four hours later
27 (0.2)
28 Lin: Mm hmm
29 (0.8)
30 Beth: Oh well(h)
31 Lin: (h)(h)-(h)(h) (h)e(h) (h)e(h) (h)e(h) so: have you
32 heard any news abouduh Zhongda orng:: (0.2) thee old
33 friends?
[BL, 5:6]

At lines 15-16, Beth locates as a source of the misunderstanding a confusion concerning "day" versus "night." She explains that what she meant was "six- six thirty or seven at night" to which Lin does a receipt, "Oh:::". And in a subsequent mention of the long "nap," Beth appears to design the talk in a manner which avoids the confusion concerning "day" vs. "night," saying that the "nap" lasted "four hours."

Discussion

Regarding all of the exemplars of delayed repair initiation, it is interesting that turn A is not in itself 'trouble-source talk' but that it <u>becomes</u> trouble-source talk when juxtaposed against something else in the prior talk or when juxtaposed against what the recipient (NNS) knows. At the moment when repair is initiated, the talk of turn A is 'now' understood differently from the way it was understood before (i.e., at turn B). In the talk which comes <u>after</u> repair is initiated, the newly displayed trouble-source is pursued, clarified, elaborated, questioned, and the like.

Interestingly, the interactional resources by which participants hear current and next turns as tied to one another has still provided a resource by which the participants in my data deal with problems in the talk which are not caught immediately. In a realignment of the talk (i.e., turn 1 with turn A), these participants may have retrieved information or knowledge which perhaps was not 'shared' between them.

The NNS almost let a troublesome element slip through the cracks--at the claimed understanding--of T2. The delayed repair initiation, coming <u>after</u> turn C, seems to reflect a delay in understanding, a delay in fully grasping the import of the talk at turn A. (In (13), however, perhaps NNS never fully grasped the import of the talk at turn A.)

One might say about the instances of delayed next turn repair initiation that 'next turn position' has been retrieved

collaboratively. Retrieved, perhaps, just in time, just before other talk and other actions might potentially complicate matters and make it difficult for the one with a repair to initiate (NNS) to return to the 'trouble-source utterance.'"

By way of these instances, then, we may have indirect support for the suggestion that the primary site of other-initiated repair is next turn relative to the trouble-source utterance. Speaker of the 'trouble-source turn' (NS) basically holds off on further talk (further actions) which provides recipient of the 'trouble-source turn' (NNS) with another opportunity to get repair-initiation accomplished in a delayed 'next turn position.'

Conclusion

What we have displayed in these data is empirical evidence which supports the suggestion that small bits of behavior such as "uh huh," "mm hmm," and the like, do not display or evidence understanding but, at best, 'claim' it (Schegloff 1982):[10]

> ...'uh huh' is merely a claim of understanding. Such a claim may turn out to be incorrect and passing one opportunity to initiate repair is compatible with initiating repair later. (Schegloff 1982:88)

On some occasions, other-initiated repair may be two-phased:the recipient (NNS) initially receipts the 'trouble-source turn' and subsequent to that, initiates repair. By producing the talk as receipt first and then repair, the first repair opportunity position from which other speaker could have

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

initiated repair is allowed to pass. On these occasions, repair is not 'caught' as early as possible (Schegloff et al., 1977). Other-initiated repair is not done 'immediately' but is 'delayed.'

The notion of 'immediate' versus 'delayed' has been discussed in prior work with respect to self-repairs. Levelt (1983) finds that some self-repairs occur 'immediately' after the troublesome element while other self-repairs are 'delayed' until some point after the troublesome element. Yet with respect to other-repairs, past research has not suggested that other-initiated repairs may be 'delayed' as well.

Out of this investigation, one comes away with the sense that the notion of sequential relevancies which, as I have stated at the outset, is a resource by which participants themselves come to produce talk which is mutually intelligible, may, on occasion, be somewhat different when the context is NS-NNS interaction. It appears that NNSs do not necessarily use all the resources available to them for repairing talk. For instance, they do not do other-initiated repair the first chance they get, i.e., in the next turn relative to the trouble-source turn. There is an alternative to initiating repair in the next turn:receipting the just prior turn and doing repair later. On these occasions, the repair process may operate at a somewhat slower pace.[11]

References

Atkinson, J. M. and J. Heritage (Eds.) Structures of Social Action. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. (1984a). Conversation analysis. In J. Heritage, Garkfinkel and Ethnomethodology, Polity Press.

Heritage, J. (1984b). A change of state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (Eds.), Structures in Social Action:Studies in Conversation Analysis (pp. 299-345). Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.

Levelt, W. (1983). Monitoring and self-repair in speech. Cognition, 14:41-104.

Rawls, A. (1989). Language, self, and social order:a reformulation of Goffman and Sacks. Human Studies, 12, 147-173.

Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., and Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. Language 53:361-382.

Schegloff, E. and Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. Semiotica, 7:289-327.

Schegloff, E. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement:some uses of "uh huh" and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics, (pp. 71-93), Washington, D.C.:Georgetown University Press.

Schegloff, E. (1987). Recycled turn beginnings:a precise repair

mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organization. In Button and Lee (Eds.), Talk and Social Organization (pp. 70-85), Clevedon:Multilingual Matters.

Schegloff, E. (1989). Reflections on language, development and the interactional character of talk-in-interaction. In M. Bornstein and J.S. Bruner (Eds.), Interaction and Human Development (pp. 139-153). Hillsdale, NJ:Erlbaum

1.This paper represents a revised version of a chapter from my dissertation. 1994. Repair in Native-Nonnative English-Conversation:The Element "Yeah" in Same-Turn Repair and Delayed Next Turn Repair Initiation. I remain deeply indebted to my dissertation co-chairs, Emanuel Schegloff and Marianne Celce-Murcia, for valuable comments, insights, and encouragement. Any remaining errors are mine, however.

2. Cf. Heritage (1984) for a detailed discussion of the notion of adjacency pair structure.

3. Schegloff et al. (1977) also discuss insertion sequences coming between an NTRI and its response and post expansion sequences which follow an initial NTRI sequence.

4. Schegloff et al. (1977) have found that recipient of the troublesome talk ordinarily does not interrupt the turn-in-progress even though s/he may have a repair to initiate. For example, Susan waits until Steven has completed the turn before she produces the utterance "eleven? eight, nine, ten?" which initiates repair but does not do actual repair, leaving the task of repair to the speaker of the trouble-source turn:

Steven: One, two, three, ((pause)) four five six, ((pause)) eleven eight nine ten.
--> **Susan: Eleven? eight, nine, ten?**
Steven: Eleven, eight, nine, ten.
--> **Nancy: Eleven?**
Steven: Seven, eight, nine, ten.
Susan: That's better.
[Schegloff et al. 1977, GJ:FN]

5. Cf. Heritage on "Oh" in Atkinson and Heritage (1984).

6. With the proper inflection, there may be some "Ohs" which do signal trouble e.g., "Oh::?" but in the examples discussed in this chapter there is not that sort of inflection attached to the "Oh." Also cf. Heritage (1984) on "Oh."

7. My thanks to Heidi Riggenbach for supplying me with the transcript from which this example originates.

8. Cf. Schegloff (1982).

9. Cf. Drummond and Hopper (1991) on the 'distance' principle in the organization of repair.

10. Some linguists (e.g., Yngve 1980; Duncan and Fiske 1977; etc.) refer to utterances such as "uh huh," "mm hmm," "yeah," and the like, as 'backchannel cues.' The claim is that a speaker producing

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

one of these utterances displays that s/he is attending and/or understanding the talk. (cf. Schegloff 1982 for another interpretation of "uh huh.")

11. Here, I am reminded of a comment from Schegloff (1989) about the 'not-yet-competent' in language:

> ...for the not-yet-competent--the children, the strangers, etc.--...Time is slower, each aspect larger, recognizing and negotiating through the contingencies a more robust project, and all of it potentially being both done and learned at the same time. They learn to deal with the moment to moment contingencies of life in interaction, and the details of language use and conduct, in the moment to moment contingencies of life in interaction, with their deployments of language and other conduct. The language learned there has its character and structure informed by the structure and contingencies of interaction, just as the practices for using the language are so informed. (Schegloff 1989)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE